

## REMARKS

Applicants have cancelled claims 20-24 without prejudice expressly reserving the right to pursue the subject matter of the cancelled claims in one or more subsequently filed applications.

Pending Claim 15 and withdrawn claims 25 and 30 are amended to recite that the aftertreatment device comprises an exhaust gas recirculation arranged downstream of the reforming unit. Claim 32 is amended to recite that the method further comprises supplying reformat to the engine, by way of an exhaust gas recirculation operably arranged downstream of the reforming unit. Support for these amendments is found on page 5, lines 9-11 and page 23, lines 8-11 of the application

Claim 35 is objected to for reciting “reactor” rather than “unit.” Applicants have amended claim 35 to recite “unit” rather than “reactor.”

Applicants have added new dependent claims 38 to 41. Support for these claims is found in the application as follows:

For new claim 38, which recites that the exhaust gas aftertreatment device of claim 15 further comprising a catalytic converter arranged closed to the engine, support is found on page 16, lines 10 to 14.

For new claim 39, which recites that the exhaust gas aftertreatment device of claim 15 wherein the NO<sub>x</sub> storage catalytic converter is configured to generate NH<sub>3</sub> by reduction of accumulated NO<sub>x</sub> with H<sub>2</sub>, support is found on page 22, line 18 to page 23, line 8.

For new claim 40, which recites that the exhaust gas aftertreatment device of claim 15 wherein the reforming unit is the reforming unit as being

configured as an autothermal reforming reactor, support is found on page 3, line 20 to page 4, line 3.

For new claim 41, which recites that the exhaust gas aftertreatment device of claim 15 further comprising a secondary injection device arranged upstream of the reforming unit being operable for post-engine introduction of reducing agents into the exhaust gas upstream of the reformer, support is found on page 4, line 18 to 22; page 22, lines 1-6; and page 11, lines 2-6.

Claims 15, 16, 19, and 32-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stranglmaier et al. (US Patent No. 6,732,507) in view of Stroia et al. (US Publ. No. 2004/0006975). Applicants respectfully disagree and in view of the amendments to the claims requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Claim 15 as amended recites that the aftertreatment device comprises an exhaust gas recirculation arranged downstream of the reforming unit. Support for this amendment is found on page 5, lines 9-11 and page 23, lines 8-10 of the application as filed.

Applicants have also amended claim 32 to further recite "...supplying reformat to the engine, by way of an exhaust gas recirculation operably arranged downstream of the reforming unit." Support for this amendment is found on page 5, lines 11-12 and page 23, lines 8-14 of the application as filed, wherein Applicants disclose a exhaust gas recirculation downstream of the reformer and that in the rich burn mode reformat can be fed to the engine combustion.

Neither Stranglmaier et al. nor Stroia alone or in combination teach or suggest including an exhaust gas recirculation arranged downstream of the reforming unit. Stranglmaier and Stroia also fail to teach or suggest supplying reformat to the engine by way of a exhaust gas recirculation. Thus

Stranglmaier et al. in combination with Stroia fail to teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

The foregoing remarks demonstrate that Stroia in combination with Straglmaier et al. fails to render the invention of the claims 15, 16, 19, and 32-37 and new claims 38-41 obvious. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims 15, 16, 19, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stranglmaier et al. in view of Stroia.

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for purportedly being unpatentable over Stranglmaier et al. in view of Stroia as applied to claim 15 and 16 above, and further in view of Murachi et al. (US Patent No. 5,746,989). Applicants disagree.

As discussed above, the combination of Stranglmaier et al. and Stroia do not fail to teach or suggest an exhaust gas recirculation arranged downstream of the reforming unit and thus fail to render the invention as claimed obvious. Murachi et al. does not compensate for the deficiencies of Stranglmaier and Stroia as Murachi et al. also fails to teach or suggest an exhaust gas recirculation arranged downstream of the reforming unit. Therefore the combination of Stranglmaier et al., Stroia and Murachi et al. fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

The foregoing remarks demonstrate that the combination of Stranglmaier et al., Stroia and Murachi et al. fails to render the invention obvious and Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Stranglmaier et al., Stroia and Murachi et al.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Application No. 10/552,263  
Reply  
Attorney Docket No. 095309.56876US

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #095309.56876US).

Respectfully submitted,

July 1, 2009

  
Mary Anne Schofield  
Registration No. 36,669

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
GRE:mas/slw  
7882636